

GAC Medicaid Transition Day Services Work Group
1056 Woodbrook Conference Room, Dover
April 16, 2015 10 a.m. – 12 p.m.

Present: Susanna Eaton-Ryan, The ARC of DE; Barb Monahan, DD Council; Gary Cassedy, Easter Seals; Jessica Hurtado, Self Advocate; Angie Sipple, GAC; Lisa Furber, Disabilities Law Prg.; Alice Kavinon, UPS; Katina Demetrio, Autism Delaware; John Mahon, Chimes; Lisa Elias, Families Speaking Up; Kimberly Reinagel-Nietubicz, CGO

We'll start with introductions, and I will remind you that we are recording so everyone when we are speaking, later on, say your name first. Did Barb get anywhere, where is Barb?

I'm Susanna Eaton Ryan, I am the director of employment and outreach for the ARC of Delaware.

Jess--

Where should I sit?

Wherever you want, Barb.

See you later.

We are introducing ourselves.

Okay. I tried to email you, but it kept coming up as Vic Borrows. I'll tell you I won't be at the meeting next week.

Okay.

Barb, do you want to introduce yourself?

My name is Barb Monahan. I'm the chair for the Developmental Disability Council and I am a self-advocate.

I'm Jessica Hurtado, I'm the president of the self-determination group at the ARK's office in Newcastle and I'm also a self-advocacy.

Gary Cassidy, I'm vice president of programs at Easter Seals.

Angie Sipple, Governor's Advisory Council parent.

Lisa Furber, Community Legal Aid Society.

Alice Kavinon, with UPS.

Katina Demetrio with Autism Delaware.

John Mann, I am the COO at Chimes Delaware

Lisa Elias sitting in for Teesie Bonk for Families Speaking up

Okay, the only person I know that Terry Hancharick could not make it, so she sent me an email. I did not hear from anyone else, so we will see if they trickle in. We need someone to keep time, and preferably someone who is going to attend all the meetings. Now I am already being cranky (chuckling). (laughter) Seriously, would anyone please volunteer? Thanks. And we're pretty sure you'll be here every time?

I will.

Okay. Great, thanks. And please remember to say your name before you speak, as we are being recorded.

Susanna, excuse me. You skipped Kimberly.

I didn't really skip her, I just, she's sitting there in the background.

My name is Kimberly (inaudible) and I am here representing the legislative branch in the (inaudible) office.

We are happy to have you.

Thank you.

Even though we skipped you, or I skipped you. (laughter) Okay, so Marissa is going to keep time, that's a good thing. Last time Terry said this is a good group, we don't need to have meeting rules, but we probably do need to have some meeting rules. So I listed a few things. Would anyone like to offer up other ideas?

One question I've got and certainly no offense, I'm a little confused in terms of membership, and given that these are public meetings, I assume we are going to have some folks attending out of the blue who are citizens, and whatever their other capacities might be. Do I assume correctly that people who are the drop in guests do not participate in the discussion?

That's my understanding, and also I think it's worth discussion, are people allowed to send substitutes for themselves, and that's, I think that's a group decision for us as a dedicated system issue.

Otherwise all we are is--

I did was to add that I asked around and no one could remember from the larger group if the decision was finalized.

It was.

Okay, so then—

That was my impression.

In a discussion there certainly wasn't consensus, or it wasn't unanimous, but the decision was that the answer was no.

Okay, so then--

Which I guess it's one of the dangers--

Melissa sitting over there with Vernon and Kimberly and John is handling the timekeeping for today, I mean, the record-keeping? Record-keeping.

I'm handling the record-keeping?

With the black thumb? Maybe Katina will do it.

I'll do it,

Just right there

Was I just elected, you want me to play with this?

Yes.

Okay. I will do that, but I, I warn you. All of this could be gone (chuckling).

So I leave the table.

I don't think it matters where people sit.

You don't have to leave the table.

There is a matter of order in terms of participation.

Well, she might like someone here who is going to actively work--

So, all you really want me to do is turn this off when we're done? If I do anything else (chuckling)--

And I do want to remind people, one person talks at a time, I'm pretty sure that's standard for every meeting. And additionally please announce yourself so that you are recorded as the person speaking. So, I said refer to the email. Those were things that I just listed about meeting rules. Do we want to come up with specific meeting rules?

Another question, and this is no offense. But Marissa is not on the list. There aren't any DDDS on the list, so I was assuming there weren't any members.

You're a member, though, aren't you?

She is on the list? Oh, this is Susanna.

Marissa is on the list. She is second from the bottom.

The updated list?

It was the second list that came out. I'm not sure if I've seen that. This is John, I'm sorry.

Yes, this is Lisa. It was sent a couple days ago with a timeline.

One of our challenges, we've got so many documents flowing that it looks like up to an inch already.

(chuckle)

This is my packet.

Who else, what else, Does somebody have the updated list?

I have it. On my phone.

Sorry.

Gary, I will make a note to send you the updated list, and I'll put a big flag on it that says that this is the up dated list, and does that mean you didn't get the time-line either? This is Susanna.

If it was the same message, that's possible, but it's more likely that I overlooked it in the flood of things.

Okay, so we've cleared that up, that Marissa is actually on this committee. And I believe we did discuss that at the last meeting, that she would be representing DDDS on this committee. So--

Can't rely on my memory, that's for sure. (chuckling)

This is John. I will confirm that I got the email, I just didn't see it.

Okay.

Yeah, I got your list emailed too.

This is Susanna. I'm trying to send the same subject matter in each email I send to you, and if there some way we can do that simply, so that it will flag you that that's an email about this working group, but I'm trying to use the same subject every time. And I think that that might help, and if you remember to look at those emails because they'll always have the same subject matter, and that will probably help clarify things. I do think it's problematic that the same things come out from different people, so you get the same things three different times. I do most things. But like I said, I'll try to make sure the subject is always the same on mine.

>>This is Angie Sipple can you make the subject, the thing that it transitions, however it's called, transition meeting, but specifics, so just maybe dash time-line slash new member.

I'll be glad to do that.

Otherwise, I'm going through 5 or 6 different ones to find what we are looking, what we are talking about. Because I am not going to print gobs and gobs of paper.

I think, This is Susanna. Everyone in this community knows that we have a tremendous amount of the email churn that goes on all the time. And it's hard to just keep up and to make sure that you're looking at what's important versus just everything. The more you put in the subject, the less you are going to see any way, you're only going to see a certain amount when it pops up on yours. I will try to use this committee name and the specific of it in the email underneath that, and feedback if it doesn't help. Let me know.

Should we go introduce ourselves again since Brian just walked in?

It's okay, but I can introduce myself. So, I'm Brian Freedman, I'm from the University of Delaware Center for Disabilities Studies. I apologize, I'm a little bit late.

So we're, this is Susanna, we are still back to creating a list of rules that we are going to follow for every committee meeting.

And I'm Tom (inaudible), Governor's Advisory Council.

Would anyone like to suggest what ones I sent out in the email, or would you like me to tell you what I put? One person speaks at a time, start and end meetings on time, be prepared and to be present, stick to the agenda. I also added, in my own mind, turn your cell phone off. Does anyone want to add something to that, change it? Agree to use those rules? Is everyone in agreement?

Yeah.

Yes.

Yeah.

The next thing I put on the agenda was to review the goals and objectives of this planning group, this work planning group, and I think there should be some discussion about that. Katina, do you want to lead that discussion?

You know, we had a little conversation at the DVC meeting about it but all the work that that needs to be done in a short time frame, that we are getting information. The day that we first met, we just got the North Dakota information. There's a lot of stuff to digest. What I am concerned about is spending too much time in here talking about what we should be doing outside of here. Does that make sense? So if we could look at even maybe assigning different areas that each of us should be looking at when we get to supported employment, community based, pre-vocational, or day hab, that way we are not all looking at all of the information, because we could really be spinning, and just not getting--

This is Susanna, I think that's a great idea, to make specific assignments as we get into it, although right now I think what we are trying to do is determine what is the real goal of this work-group.

To come up with a tool to present to--

To the DDDS. We are actually advising DDDS with a tool that we create, and I think it's just important to keep us focused on that, that this is not about ideology, it is not about personal beliefs, it's about creating the tool that fits the criteria of what CMS requires, and to give DDDS the benefit of our understanding of what should be on the tool. Is everyone on the same page with that or do we have anyone who would like to offer up another, other information in that?

This is Angie Sipple. I am on the same page with that, but are we also looking at recommending participant tools that go along with the self-assessment tool?

I don't think we've been tasked with that. That could be a question for Marissa to take back to Jane. This is Susanna, sorry.

It was my understanding that this group would be looking at the assessments for the process, so if the decision is that the group wants to work on a provider self-assessment, that is one, but there would also be the other pieces that go along with that, so the look back document, and perhaps it's the same thing, but that needs to be considered. So it's not just the provider self-

assessment, it's the other assessment items or the other process that goes along with a full assessment of the current services.

You mean the second phase?

On the timeline.

Did they break it down, provider--

Yeah.

So it's all the assessment activity--

This is Susanna. I'm looking at the timeline, and the assessment tool is to be complete by June 15. All the other things come after that and I don't know that they are necessarily part of what this committee is expected to do. I'd like some clarification on that from DDDS.

This is John. My understanding was that given the tight time-line that exists, that it was going to be limited to just this self- assessment tool, the provider self-assessment tool, and that the other pieces would follow at some point. What I think we do need to keep into consideration that this is a very tight time-line in order to get this done. So if you're taking that back Marissa, to Jane, I think that needs to be part of the consideration.

This is Marissa. I will take it back.

Again, just to reiterate, we only have 2 hours in each meeting once a week to get this done, if we are going to stay on this time schedule, and we are going to do this in 2 hours. I think we want to be careful we don't muddy what it is we're trying to do.

This is Susanna. I totally agree with John on that. My question, another question to Marissa to take back to Jane. Does, would do the DDDS benefit from four separate assessment tools based on the four day waivers that we have, or would they like, would it be better to do one that incorporates all four?

This is Marissa. And I think this is the decision of the group. If the decision is that one assessment can be created that will apply to all for existing day service options, individuals support employment groups for employment pre-voc, and day habilitation, then that's fine. But if the group wants to identify or create three or four different assessments for each type of service, that can be done too. That's a decision for this group. That's not going to be DDDS' decision.

So that will be the first order of our business, are we deciding 4 or 1?

Katina's raising her eyes.

What do you think, Katina?

I think there has to be a discussion about it because all four things in themselves can be assessed very differently. I think there can be a core around all of them and then maybe the last bracket of questions specific to that service.

This is Susanna. Did anyone read the Pennsylvania assessment? Did anyone have a chance to read that? I thought it was interesting that they start that assessment with, I sent that out. They start that assessment with questions, which waivers do you serve.

I read it.

This is John. I just went through this 2 days ago. We serve folks from Pennsylvania as well and the individual that we did 2 days ago even had a different status within those selections. So as we gathered the information for the auditor we were actually gathering a series of different sets of data that supported the individual plan, which was different than Pennsylvania's community-based waiver they were asking for, I don't know that, it's a very complicated process is what we experienced. But they do, apparently they do break this down by individual. The second individual who is due for an audit next month, they sent us the guidelines for that, and that has a whole set, different set of data that we have to gather for that audit, so Pennsylvania seems to have split this out over a series of different types of services and how their services are being measured. So the Pennsylvania plan from our experience is pretty complicated. But they are splitting it out, they're not counting it, it's not community based waiver everybody fits. It's community based waiver with this category, this category, this category. I actually should have brought, I didn't think about it, I could have brought a blacked out copy--

Could you send that to me, and I'll distribute to everyone?

Yes, I'll send it to you.

This is Gary Cassidy. I read it quickly this morning and I think luckily in Delaware things are a lot simpler than that because there is not a number of waivers that we are dealing with. There is a single waiver that we are dealing with under DDDS. And my understanding from the preliminary discussion in the first meeting is this process only pertains to individuals served under the current DDDS home and community based services waiver. There is not more than one waiver in play--

This is Susanna.

for DDDS.

I thought there were four.

There's not four waivers?

No, there's one waiver, there are four--

All of those roll up into one.

It applies to the comprehensive waiver, it applies to our 1959 SPA pathways, but it also applies to other Medicaid funded services, so those folks on state plan, so it's not just those folks on the comprehensive waiver.

Okay, well for one thing, Pathways is not in effect yet, so that's moot for the time being--

But the same tool will be--

Okay--

In the future--

Well, at any rate, it's not as complicated as Pennsylvania, so I would suggest that we not spend a lot of time looking at the Pennsylvania tool because most of it is irrelevant to what is going on in Delaware. We may have to indeed, you know, have a little bit of specification into I guess it's who the particular participant is, because it's my understanding, 50% of the folks we serve live with their families. And the vast majority of those folks aren't going to be covered under straight Medicaid.

Marissa is shaking her head yes.

Okay, but I thought it was only the waiver that this whole thing pertained to.

No. Medicaid Home and Community Based Services, and that includes all services that are funded under state plan, the comprehensive waiver.

I guess I'm not clear on what difference does it make, because in Delaware all of the programmatic requirements are the same regardless of which category somebody is in, so I think it's a moot point, and we don't need to concern ourselves with the undue complexities of Pennsylvania. That is my point. If we proliferate materials from other states about things that don't pertain to the discussion, we are going to spin into a lot of spent time that is not going to be productive.

This is Katina. I also think it's important when we are doing this, because we are all serving folks that might be receiving multiple services under the waiver so we are going to have to identify on that for basis of when it gets down to the individual as community based waiver in all the four areas that we are looking at because all of us are serving folks that are probably getting supported employment as well as day services. Correct? And if we're going to have a tool to assess, and it's going to be different, we are going to have to be able to pull that, am I making sense, 'cause I feel like I'm not. (chuckling) I'm sorry.

Well, this is Brian, so I might be missing something on the Pennsylvania tool, but to Gary's point, yes, there's many many waivers listed. However it seems like the way that it's structured, and I know you've gone through this, so maybe you can speak to this, but there is a set of questions apply to all of the waivers and different services within the program so I think that although the Pennsylvania system itself is certainly seems much more complex than ours, the survey tool itself I think is designed in such a way so that it would allow, it allows services under multiple waivers to be assessed with the same questions. Where survey questions I think might be applicable, but certainly determining sort of, you know, what categories people fall in--

Right, the assessment activities aren't differentiated, you're just doing bureaucratic housecleaning first.

Right.

And this is Susanna. John and I had a little conversation before everyone got here, and my consensus through all of the states that I've look at is that it's very, very broad. There's nothing specific. I mean I feel like I could write this up tonight before I go to bed and be done with it. It's

that broad and simple. And I know it's not when it comes right down to it and people are answering these questions and they may have ramifications that are not necessarily good for the person we serve, but if they all seem very broad and very simple, and they all seem as John and I both agree, to be based on the person-centered plan. And whether or not this person centered a plan, can these questions be answered that way.

That is a good point. This is Gary Cassidy. In terms of the Delaware system, the distinction between folks who are on the waiver versus Medicaid state plan, the folks on the Medicaid state plan in many cases don't have a real gate, so we've got a bifurcated system by virtue of what their funding stream is. It's a very different picture in terms of what the foundation is for service planning. So, you know, roughly 50% of the folks of the 550 people Easter Seal serves do not have an ELP.

Right. This is John. My understanding, though, was, 'cause I am a little confused by who this at least right now, who this survey is for, and so those people that would be fitting into this community based survey are people who are funded through Medicaid waiver and all of those people do have a plan.

Through Medicaid.

Okay. So help me understand 'cause I am a little bit confused now. Given Gary's comment, are the family support people part of this survey or are they not part of this survey?

This is Marissa. When you say the family support people, are you talking about--

I'm talking about people who don't have the ELP's--

The ELP services for state plan and Medicaid?

Yes. People who do not have ELP, so they have no driver for their services, basically is what we are saying.

The plan for those folks is the plan that the agency has.

Okay, so there is a plan available that can be the driver.

That's correct.

'Cause I think that's what Susanna and I were kind of talking about. What is the driver for the survey? You are saying it doesn't exist?

No, what I am saying is that we all have different ones, and the tool is the tool. It just has to be accepted. Mine is going to look very very different than yours.

I understand. But if the process, I'm sorry, this is John. Someone said to continue to identify myself. If the process is the same where the decision is either being made by the individual receiving the service or by the team that supports them, that is the basis for the driver, even if the plan cosmetically looks different, okay. So I guess to me this is very basic. It's that driver that determines whether or not the individual who desires the service is receiving the service they want that fits into the community based waiver. Unless I am misunderstanding what that process is.

This is Lisa. I am listening to this discussion and I heard something Susanna said about, you know, the questions are very basic, and maybe we're spending too much time thinking about

that, because I am going back to something that Jane said about the evidence that we are going to require to support the answers on the survey tool. For example, you can answer affirmatively, yes, I do all these community things, but now you have got to prove that you are actually doing that, so this is the policy is a picture is a, and maybe that is the part that we need to--

This is Susanna. The look-behind doesn't happen until September 2015. This group is just doing the assessment. So in fact we may recommend evidence but that is far down the road from here.

This is Katina, but I also think we need to be mindful when crafting these questions for the tool that it's going to be clear, crystal clear, what the expectation is going to be presented by the provider community on hitting an affirmative to that, because if it is open and broad, those who are doing a look behind may not understand the services we're delivering, and if they don't understand the tool that I am giving, they have been to John's program, and see one tool, and I have another tool, and they look very different, I want to make sure that it's clear, and that can be driven by the questions that are being asked, I believe.

This is Marissa, and I think is exactly why I don't think you can divorce the look behind or the subsequent assessment steps from this initial process. I think that the committee needs to look the entirety and recommend the steps for the full assessment process and any perhaps tools that go along with that.

This is Gary, I agree. My impression is that the verification phase essentially would be based on the same tool as the provider self-assessment, it's just other individuals looking the same information with different eyes, and indeed verifying as is describes that what the provider cites in terms of their evidence, etc., is valid, and supported by what they find on the ground. So I think they are inextricably linked if not exactly one and the same, it's just, as it says, it's really a follow behind survey by perhaps different parties. Keep in mind the first section is self-assessment, so it's a third party, whoever that may be. It could even be this same group. It was not clear who is going to do the verification studies or whatever it's called. It may well be the same group that is charged with going out and seeing what we see in person.

That seems, this is Susanna. Everyone is in agreement on that. So, I am sorry, who was going to keep track of the time?

(laughter)

Okay so do we have a clear, can we concisely write what the goal of this committee is so that we can--

This is Gary. I would suggest pursuant to that, it seems like one of the first questions is whether we do four separate provider self-assessments by service type, as Marissa listed, or if we do one that is designed to address all of those regardless of service type.

This is Susanna. I think, that makes sense. So one question that we have the answer is are we doing one or four? The other question that seems like the group is in agreement and that we have already answered is, we're also going to make recommended steps for the next two parts of this process, which are the actual assessment process and the look behind.

This is Gary. From my understanding, that is beyond our purview. Ya know, I don't, I think Jane left some preface out. I don't know how it's decided what the second phase looks like, we are developing the foundation with the assessment tool. How it's administered thereafter, I didn't think we were charged with that, but again, maybe Marissa can get back with Jane and ask for some guidance.

This is Susanna. I think Marissa just said, recommending steps for the full process.

This is Marissa. Again, I thought just a minute ago you agreed with that, so now I am confused. I agreed that they are inextricably linked.

Yeah.

But I didn't think, for instance, Jane was setting forth some principles in terms of who would participate in the second part, so it made it sound to me like it didn't have anything to do with us. I disagree with some of her basis comments because it simply didn't make any sense in terms of the composition of the overall planning group. But that is part of what led me to believe that our work was essentially done at June 30th unless she charged us with follow-up activity. You know, I can see it making sense either way, but--

But I think for the, this is Katina, I'm sorry, but I think for the process of identifying the questions, we should be kind of putting over on the side what is going to be the proof in some of those areas that we have some debate over, and make those recommendations of here is what the team or whomever is doing the look behind should be looking for.

So this is John. So what you are suggesting is that is not today's conversation, that that conversation should happen in 4 or 5 weeks. We focus on--

That's correct.

This is Gary. I think that is a good point, because, you know, all of these judgments as you need the various tools, most of them are highly subjective, and we all come with our own presets, you know, for a variety of reasons, and the more we can specify what would be sufficient evidence of compliance, the better off everyone is because it takes more and more of the subjectivity out of it and provide, indeed provide specific guidance moving towards the future.

Thomas, you haven't weighed in at all. Do you, can you add anything to this for us?

You know, like Gary said, it would be kind of like, when you look at both processes a little bit, like Katina said, as we go forward.

Okay.

Barb and Jess also have not. Did you want to contribute anything to this part of the conversation?

I don't quite understand what everybody is talking about.

(chuckling)

Join the club, I think you're on the same page as all of us here.

(laughter)

So it looks like right now, we have two things. Are we doing 1 or 4? And we seem to sort of all be in agreement that we are going to discuss the evidence that is going to be used, but we are not going to discuss it until we are about four weeks into this process. Is that, did I--

I think that sounds like a plan.

Okay, so then we may as well talk about. We have, I don't want to jump on Marissa's job here, but I think we have about 10 more minutes to talk about whether or not we want to do 1 or 4.

This is Gary. I think inevitably we need to do four separate assessments or at least sections that are specific to program types because they are highly varied amongst agencies but by program type they are essentially different one from another and typically the setting is in most cases the setting is distinctly different by program type.

And I have to agree. I think we need to look at a core assessment that looks at all four that can be general to all four because we have definitions for all four, and then have them have a subset of questions for each area, because again, when it gets to a level of the individual being able to do a self assessment they are going to be able to use the same tool, and if they are getting multiple services, then that is also a way, I think, in the future to see how you hold accountability to moving folks through.

So we only have one position here, that we have one core and then we have subsets. Four subsets, is that what we are--

This is John. As I understood as it being put out, was that we were going to have this core group, but then the subsets would measure each of the four services that were offered, and it seems to me that the rationale for that is pretty simple. Each of these four subsets have different outcomes attached to them, and the outcomes, and from my point of view, the outcomes are where the evidentiary information is, that determines whether or not the service meets the guidelines or the requirements. So the evidence is developed to the outcomes for each one, so support employment has a different outcome attached to it than pre-voked may have or that day hab may have, so you need to have those outcomes attached as that subset. Does that make sense?

I concur. That's kind of what I was trying to say.

(chuckling)

Did that help?

It is all outcome driven, that is why we are doing this.

This is Brian. I think in terms of a process, though, it might be good to start with those, developing those core questions first that we know will apply to all different categories, because I think that will help us discern what specific questions will need to be asked. I mean, it may be that we find, for example, that supported employment and group supported employment do not require two separate assessments. So before we definitively move and each one requires its own, I'd recommend that we develop that core set and then sort of hold open the possibility that there might be grouping between some. I agree with what others are saying, that the goals of each of the services is typically quite different, although as everyone is also saying, they share many similar characteristics.

This is John. Susanna sent out this HTBS setting, your provider required self assessment, and I had a chance to look at it quickly, and a lot of it is related to residential, not today programs, but I'm thinking that what is here if reworded, to fit what happens within day programs, this may be the core. The core may be already here, 'cause some of the questions that seem to be very basic in terms of community integration, privacy issues, and as I said, a lot of it is residential oriented, but it certainly could be interpreted to fit day programming.

This is Susanna.

Maybe the core already exists.

Is that South Dakota, John?

I don't know, this is the one you sent out, and all I see is HCBS setting provider requirements.

I think that is South Dakota.

Okay.

This is Susanna. If you have looked through as many as we have which aren't that many, the things that I have noticed, they are almost all residential focused, number one. And number two, whether they are residential focused or not, there is a group of questions that is in the tool kit that is in most of these that sort of crosses everything, and I think that is the core that John and Katina are talking about. And I think that, like I said, they are pretty simple, like a set of 8-10 questions that you can find in each one that sort of pertain to everything, and it all sort of boils down to, do you have a choice? Is choice being given to these people based on their person-centered plan?

This is Gary. A suggestion, kind of project management. We have got so many documents and some of them are not clearly labeled, so for reference, I would suggest that one way or another we assign a number to each document so that we can have a common point of reference, so we end up with a list of all the documents we've already got, and then as we add more, they can go on to the bottom of the list, and we can refer to each one by number. Because otherwise it's a nightmare getting us all on literally on the same page.

This is Susanna. I will have someone go through all the documents that we have thus far, assign numbers to them, and do you want me to resend them to you? How would you like me to provide that information to you?

I would suggest essentially we end up with a, it would look like a table of contents, but just the number, and whatever is recognizable at the top of the first page of each document, so we can all get our ducks in a row and have the same reference point.

Marissa, you look like you are waiting to talk.

This is Marissa. I have, I agree with that. It would be helpful to easily reference resources. I have a question though. Did everyone here receive the Desapid created, the Delaware Desapid that created checklist, this was an attempt from Desapid to transfer or interpret the questions from the CMS exploratory questions to assist state in assessment of non-residential home and community service settings into an actual, perhaps, checklist.

We don't know if we've got it or not. (laughter)

I've not seen that.

We discussed it the last meeting, that it was out there, but I don't believe it was sent out.

Okay, I am going to copy this for you. I think that we attempted, or DDS has attempted to try to provide examples from other states of assessments they've done, but I think a lot of them as you have seen, are focusing on residential. This may perhaps help non-residential settings as this group is tasked with, so let me make copies of this.

This is Gary. One of the things I noticed, the same thing that most of the information we've seen pertains to residential, and specifically residential assessment examples, but on a couple of them, I went through with my yellow marker and highlighted the ones that looked like they could pertain or could be applied to day services, and I think that is a constructive way to look at it so we can sort of separate the wheat from the chaff and the chaff is the residential part even though, you know, there may be something to be gained from some of those examples, but it's pretty easy to cherry pick the things that can be applied to day habilitation, so that the we don't spend unnecessary time on things that don't pertain--

I am sorry, is that the tool you are talking about?

I did it on at least two of them, and I went through and basically tagged the ones that looked like they would be usable or, you know, useful to discuss for day settings. Some of them are very clearly residential and we shouldn't waste our time on them. In fact, if you have pages of, that is all residential, you really ought to weed them out, 'cause there's just so much information to deal with.

Yeah, this is Barbara. Maybe we need more about the day program, if it's all residential.

Right, agreed, Barbara. This is definitely all about day, not about residential. The next part of our agenda, which we are now at, I guess we can see what Marissa is going to send around, but it really is about reviewing the tools we have been given and discussing them together. I am pretty interested in seeing what Marissa has. It might be the first thing that talks specifically about day services. Gary, do you want to talk about where you pulled, I listed the basic element review tool is the first thing to discuss. That one we all received the last meeting, that is what it says on the top. Gary, I'm sorry, it's not numbered. It's not in the Table of Contents, but it is called the CBS Basic Element Review Tool.

Hold on though.

Confuses me.

There is left-handed people.

(laughter)

And basically in here are those questions that Gary suggested we highlight which ones apply to day services. I think you will find them around page 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, like 13-24. Did anyone look at this?

Yes, I glanced at it. To go back it's Katina. This is kind of what I was talking about want first question of, there are so many different things that are coming at us, and probably more to come from hopefully examples more specific to day services that maybe if you don't mind, if we

were to be tasked with splitting these off, and say two people look at this document, and two people look at that document, be able to summarize it and bring it back with what we feel and see where we all are in alignment, because then we can say check, this is one we agree as a team, and those that we sit there and say, oh, I don't know, or we need to reword it, we can focus at future meetings.

Yeah, I think that, Susanna, that is a perfect process, and we just, we can take what we have now and assign them, does that work for everyone?

Sure.

Yes.

I listed them in the order that we were given by at the first meeting. That was really how I did it and then I added the person centered planning from the CMS final rule. That was the only I added, because I liked that. That was the prerogative. My prerogative. But I did like that, so, and I think most of us, most of the providers here got that at the Dela retreat. And Jane discussed that with us, so it was meaningful to me. Does someone want to take on (chuckling) and that is how I say it, take on the tool, basic HCBS, basic element review tool and highlight that? Do we want to do teams of two people and you can work together?

Most of my--

Yeah, and I'll look at it too.

Okay, John and Katina will be doing the tool. The next piece was, let me just look and see what I have on here, which we also received, then we will have this date. The CMS final rule, person centered, that is what I put next.

And what does that look like? What do you--

That I sent out--

I'm not in the same order any more unfortunately. That is the one you just sent out most recently?

Um hm. Actually, I sent it

Last week--

Yeah, I sent it out the first week. I am going to pass this around then.

Thank you.

Does anyone want to work on that, person centered plan? I have John and Katina.

Sure.

Okay, and it's short, Brian. Do you want to--

Does that mean I get to do another?

(laughter)

Is that what you're going to say.

No, we'll--

(laughter)

I'm happy to do this myself. I mean, this is Brian, obviously, I am sure none of this precludes anybody else also going through the documents if they want to--

Good point.

But we shouldn't feel like we have to.

This is Susanna. This is terrific, Marissa. It's the first thing that really is about day services.

This is Brian. Where did you say this came from?

This is extrapolated from the CMS toolkit, that included the program questions or the exploratory questions to states with the different settings. There is one that was issued for residential and there was one issued for non-residential.

Got it.

This is Susanna. In putting together groups to work on this, I might suggest it would be more beneficial if we didn't have two providers on a team, if we kind of mixed it up a little bit so that we got a little different input on the teams, so John and Katina, I'm saying you probably shouldn't be--

I got that message.

(chuckling)

Brian can do it himself.

That was subtle, but it came through.

Paranoid.

(laughter)

We don't want to encourage that.

(laughter)

So you are looking for one of us to split off and work with Brian, because nobody will talk to him or what?

(laughter)

No, Brian is on his own.

(laughter)

No, I've already been put in the corner, that's fine.

(laughter)

Katina?

No, I looked at Angie, but then I thought, you know what, that may not be a good relationship either.

My, you don't have many friends, do ya?

This is one of my parents. So I don't feel that it would be--

I'm not sure. This is Angie, but I have enough knowledge, we are just supposed to be eyes to take back to T.A.C. if there's questions is what I understand. I'm not sure I, so the whole process of

So you are backing out too, Angie.

(laughter)

I'm not backing out. I only have my personal area.

So maybe it's not two people. Maybe each of us take one tool since there are so many tools.

And next meeting everyone who has what they are looking at comes back and tells us what the highlights are, explains why, and we move on that, is that what you are thinking, Katina? I don't mean to speak for you, but--

No, you know, I think that the group has to, I think there is an issue also on what are the roles of each member, now we are identifying, because if Angie is someone, you know, what is her role here? Sorry.

Okay.

This is Gary. Obviously we are all here for different reasons but there is certainly common ground and I think it is overly cumbersome and artificial and presumptive to try and pigeon hole people according to what we presume their philosophical bend is. We are all going to have to dive in and try to understand everybody's perspective, but the basis is what is in writing. So I don't think we can afford to try to predict people's conflicts of interest.

This is John. I not only agree with that, I actually think, regardless of what the defined role is, there is a benefit to mixing those different points of view, where they are coming from, so I actually think there's a great role for you to play. You are going to be bringing a different perspective to the table that I might bring, and I think it's important that those things get worked out here. It's better to work them out here rather than work them out once the assessment is being done and you have walk-throughs and everything else going on. That is not the place, in my opinion, where things there may be differences of opinion to be worked out. That is just, once somebody is doing a walk-through and the assessment is done, to me, that is a very black and white process. You are either there or you are not, or you got something to fix. If there is going to be differences opinion, they should be addressed within this group, so I think there is room for all conversation.

This is Susanna. In all due respect to establishing the roles, I think in the case of Angie, while her role here may be from the Governor's Advisory Committee, what she has to offer the group is that she is a parent.

Absolutely.

So again, agreed--

You know, so it doesn't really, what the role is doesn't really matter so much as what the contribution is going to be.

She shouldn't have to work with Katina if she doesn't want to.

Well, that's true.

(laughter)

Oh, gosh. As a group, so where do we sit with that? We'd like the contribution of everyone regardless of what the role is.

That's true.

Yeah.

Yeah.

Okay. So we can put groups together even though she's your mother.

We can just count off.

(laughter)

That always works well.

I don't know. It seems like we're a little more adult than that. I think we can do better than counting off, but if that is what you want, Gary, and everyone is in agreement. Okay, we still want to know, have we determined that someone else is going to work with you, Katina, and someone is going to work with John?

Correct.

Would someone like to work with Katina? She's pretty difficult.

Wow, now they are asking for volunteers. That is not good. That is just popularity contest.

(laughter)

Crawl under the table and just get out of here.

(laughter)

I'll work by myself.

(laughter)

All right. I don't know how this could go so far.

This is Angie. How many committees are you having?

Well, they are really not subcommittees, but they are groups of reading material and right now, we have three items, and we have four states. There will be more things to review. I think we're all acknowledged that other things are going to come in. But right now we have this wonderful Desapid tool. We have the person centered plan. We have to basic element tool that Katina is tackling which really the biggest that we are looking at right now. And then each of the states. We have Pennsylvania, I think it's South Dakota, Tennessee and Massachusetts which I did not find much beneficial in them. I think maybe a group of two people could do the states right now until we get more things in there.

I'll tell you what. This is Brian. Since the basic element review tool is pretty lengthy, I'm happy to switch to that and do that with Katina, and then if somebody else wants to take the person centered service planning tool, which is actually fairly brief, I'm happy to do it that way. I'm happy to work with Katina.

Okay, I am going to volunteer for this because I haven't read it yet, so I'm most interested in this. Does anyone want to work with me on this?

Yeah, I'll work with you.

Okay, so Barb and I are going to work on the Desapid. Brian is going to work on the tool, I'm just calling it the tool to make it brief with Katina. John, do you want to work on the person centered piece?

I would be happy to do that.

Now we need some people to be doing the states. Gary, you already started working on the states, right?

Sure.

(laughter)

It doesn't matter. I'll jump in on anything. Which state do you want me to look at? Four states.

(laughter)

>>All of them.

That's what I was thinking.

State of confusion, I'll do that.

There was, I mean there's a lot of information in the North Dakota as well as in the Pennsylvania, I think they were the more robust of the four. I mean Tennessee and Massachusetts were pretty basic.

That's what I thought too. That's why I sent those out later because it just seemed like-- North Dakota?

And Pennsylvania, and then if we get anything else in during the week, I know we have to create one single thing that has all of those reference materials that we are using, and I will be working on that, but I will just add to it chronologically as we get new things in, and I am going to see if I can just make a little binder for each of you with everything in it, if that can be added to it, if that works. Or do you not want to carry one?

That's fine.

It's perfect, thank you.

This is Gary. The approach I was starting out with might help people. If they annotate or cut and paste or however they do it, the specific assessment items as they are found in a lot of these references, and with the goal of eventually coming up with a on paper brainstorm list of assessment items that we can look at that seem viable, and then we can look at the entire list as a group, massage it, pair it, etc. But we need to get out, minimize all of this information into the usable parts so that we can start moving forward on a more concrete basis. There is just so much information here.

This is Susanna. I totally agree. I'll say that I actually thought we were all going to have read all this and would start discussing it now, so my thing was that we would, the information we had

already been given, we could have a dialog about this at this meeting. I think it's clear that we can't really do that until the next meeting, and that each person assigned to a particular topic will lead that discussion about that particular reference material. Is that where everyone is thinking right now, and I like that Katina infused some process into this. I think we need to, because no one suggested any agenda items, so I was a little thrown. I wasn't really sure what, where the group wanted to go. So I'd like before we're done, to discuss agenda items. That is why I put it on there. I am just skipping 6, 7 and 8 because we don't seem ready to discuss those topics yet, so I would like to discuss how you would like to set it up for our weekly meetings. I think the idea, obviously we have now broken down into teams, individuals reviewing certain reference material, and Gary suggested that we get our papers in a row. I think that is a good thing that I can do. How would you like the meetings to be structured? What would you like? Before we move onto that. This is Brian. Did we decide who is doing this, is Gary taking all the states?

He's focusing on North Dakota and Pennsylvania.

Only the contiguous states, North Dakota, Pennsylvania.

Yeah.

(laughter)

>>Got it. Sorry

Suggestions about how to structure the meetings? Agenda items.

This is Gary. In terms of structure, I would suggest that you decide on an order of consideration of the documents that have been assigned, if you will, and we go one by one with the designated assigned people leading the brief discussion on each one of those, with the hope that we end up with bullet items that are extracted from each of those tools that we may be able to carry on to our developing laundry list of potential assessment items.

Okay. I think that works for me, does that work for everybody?

Yes.

My next question is the time-line. If we can break this down. We are required to deliver this to DDS by June 15th, and I know it was asked the beginning of this meeting that we get up on the, I guess it's the DDS website, our calendar of meetings, which we can do, but we all know what we have, essentially, between now and then. We have, I think, nine more meetings, and it think we need to create a time-line, when we are going to do it. I mean, obviously, next meeting is information.

This is Gary. And as part of that, probably for next meeting, we probably need to start with sharing the established definitions of each one of those services, because part of this is an educational process that people need to develop a foundation of knowledge through which they can understand what we are looking at in terms of assessment of services.

This is John. You talking about the four categories?

Yes.

If I'm not mistaken, that is probably just a matter of distribution. Didn't we do that with a rate setting and billing guidelines? So those things already exist.

Oh, yeah, but I assume some of the folks in the group--

No, I understand, I want to be clear, we aren't creating a new document--

Heaven forbid.

No, no.

(laughter)

No, John. We're just sending out, we're not creating, we're just sending it out.

Given the process sending papers is better than creating another document.

Okay, so I'll make sure, or Mersa, I can send out what I have, right? I have the service guidelines for all of those. I will send out the service guidelines for the core services, and I think that is a great idea to just review those. I review them all the time, because, there is so much there. But yes, I think that will help us.

(laughter)

>>Oh Katina, come on now, I didn't say that.

I hate it when somebody says, you can't do that.

(laughter)

Okay, so next meeting, we have plenty of time, I do think it's important to reiterate, please read everything before you come, because we will spin our wheels here if people haven't read what they are supposed to be reading. And I said I started out cranky, but this is cranky too. If you don't have the time, and you can't do that, this isn't the committee for you to be on 'cause we have a lot to accomplish in a very short amount of time. So I will send those out. Please read them. We'll start with a discussion about the service guidelines, which I think will be great for everyone here to kind of refresh themselves. Do you have them with you?

They're in the--

I don't need to send them out?

No, it's just that, it is the definitions, and I am not sure we have the guidance.

Statewide? Transition plan. Okay, does everyone have the statewide transition plan?

>>Not with me.

Remember, I do have--

Does anyone need this, I'm not sending out again.

I need one.

Okay, I will remember to get you, because you were not at the first meeting. Thomas, you don't have it?

I don't have what was given out last week.

Okay. I'll send it to you, I'll make sure you get a copy of it. Both you and Jess weren't at the meeting, everyone else here was. So, for the next--

(lots of talking over one another and laughing)

Being on the list is not necessarily a good thing.

No, I meant it as a compliment.

(laughing)

I am going to take it out and put it here and make tabs, 'cause I can't read it this way. I can't find it.

You are looking at this?

Yes.

Okay, yeah. I think Gary's brought up several times that there is, all these documents are dense, and there is so much in there that doesn't really apply. Part of the challenge is kind of familiarizing yourself with the documents, and knowing what does apply to us and what doesn't. And I think that is one of your responsibilities as a part of this work-group is, if you are not like Katina, not reading them the night before you go to bed, at least familiarize yourself with what is in all of the documents that we are all sharing so that it is not foreign to us when we discuss it. I didn't realize the service guidelines were in there, so obviously I didn't do my homework.

The definitions are in there, not the guidelines.

Not the service guidelines?

No.

Okay, then I will send out the service guidelines.

You might want to put the service guidelines out because that is the meat of it. The definitions are so broad still, which is good.

OK, good, now I feel better. I'll send out the service guidelines with the 500 other things I am sending out. Next meeting next week it looks like we are going to discuss the service guidelines and then each person who has been assigned a topic to read is going to take a leadership role in discussing that and what is in there. Is that correct?

>>Correct.

Yes. This is John on the person centered piece. Since nobody volunteered to work with me.

(laughter)

But I can only read one page a day.

(laughter)

All right, you guys! Okay.

And Suzanne already highlighted it.

I know. What I would like to be able to do is take those things and tie them to the guidelines, link them.

Yep.

That way I don't have to just read four pages. I can read six.

But I think, this is Susanna. This is just my opinion that everyone, even though John's been assigned person centered guidelines, everyone should be reading those, knowing those, and doing exactly what he is doing, assigning them, how they fit into what you are working on, and I think that is going to be key as we move forward. And if anyone sees that differently, now is the time to talk about that, because I know John and I are going to keep driving that home and saying, it's all about the person--

I thought you were going to say this was our opportunity to back out. (laughing)

That exists any time. How many people didn't show up today? Do we have any rules on that? If you miss two meetings, you are not on the committee any more?

No, but we drive by your house and throw eggs at it.

(laughter)

And paperwork.

(laughter)

That's it. That is what we do. Okay, time-line. Seriously, we need to think about that. Any thoughts on that? Katina, you are a good process person.

That is kind of not synonymous with my name, to be honest, that is why I--

I didn't know who you were.

Okay. I got that wrong, I am sorry.

(chuckling)

No, it's okay, I am actually flattered.

I thought you were.

I think we started to talk about it about four weeks time that we are going to be looking at the verification tool, so we have to have these, or verification documents or whatever will be, we have to have these questions somewhat drafted in about three weeks.

This is Brian. So are you saying four weeks because you are thinking ahead to the outcome and what will need to happen from there?

Oh, no--

It makes sense to maybe start at the very end or deadline and then back time it from there.

I think that is a great idea.

Yeah.

He's the new process person.

So our due date for this to turn this into DDDS is June 15th.

Right.

Okay.

And from a calendar standpoint, we probably want to be finished on June 10th because that is a Wednesday, is that correct? Yeah, it is. Okay, so we have looked to have that finished by the 10th so we can wrap it up and get it sent in to Jane by the end of that week, okay?

This is John. It seems to me you want it actually wrapped up the week before so you can go back and tear it apart and get crazy about it and bring it back--

That's right. Or do a final review of it.

A final review for submission.

On the 10th.

No, final draft on the 3rd.

Yeah, final review for submission would be on the 10th.

Should I put that on the calendar?

I am going to make a time-line for everyone. Okay, so the last step on the 10th, we will do a final review for submission. On the 3rd?

Final draft.

Right, final draft will be, okay?

On the 27th?

That gets us six other meetings.

Right, so, this is Brian, I am thinking along the parallel track, so now thinking forward, the things that we need to do are to review each of these tools and discuss. What else could come up with, the questions from those tools or that don't exist among the tools, but that we feel like are important. We talked about coming up with not just a general set of questions but perhaps a subset of questions for each of the different services.

And we have to actually include in here somewhere, writing. Actually writing it.

Um hum.

Because we are not having many weeks in here. I mean, next week we need to pretty much dig in and say, here's what we've gleaned from all of this that we think should go in there.

That's right.

Which is what I think you were alluding to is cut and paste whatever so that we can start and compile that into one document and piece it from there.

This is Gary. I would suggest that when possible we take verbatim extracts from the other documents, and then we can fine tune thereafter, because it's basically either we are going to use it or we are not. Some of them we are going to throw away, so we might as well not spend time and effort refining them.

Makes sense.

Okay, so where are we? So we are reviewing the reference material next week. The week after that, I am just calling it Gary's cut and paste. We are picking what we want from all of that, and we have two more weeks to discuss and write, finalize--

This is John. I think also there's two, that period of time you are also discussing what kind of evidentiary information you need to have to support--

Well, that is on the, I thought we all agreed, Katina said that we were going to do that when we've got most of this work done, we would put that on the side and then we would work on the evidentiary information once we got through those four weeks. That is why she had four weeks there.

Okay.

If everyone doesn't agree to that, that is, but that is I thought where we were going with that one. So--

I guess we still have a few minutes. Just something to consider. This is Brian. I mean, as we are coming up with a question, and deciding on a question that we all agree is good, I think it would be good at that point to have some discussion about what that looks like to everybody. Because otherwise we are going to go a few weeks without necessarily, with perhaps people being on completely separate pages about what that looks like, so I would recommend, as we're saying, yes, we all agree on this, then we also have a part B to that question, which is okay, what does this look like, to--

How can we verify it, and that is where we are writing that list, and then a couple weeks before we get to the final, we can go back to that list that is over there, and just make sure we tease that out.

Yeah, I mean it might be that--

It might just happen by natural progression of the question and

And there might be times when we get stuck, this is Brian again, there might be times when we get stuck and it's clear people have very different visions about what this looks like, and that is okay. Maybe we just leave that where it is and continue moving on to other questions, and we need time to revisit that and sort of hash that out.

Okay.

This is Lisa. This sounds like maybe a silly question, but we are talking about creating these lists, and cutting and pasting and making verbatim and doing lists. It seems like if we had some electronic means to be capturing during the meetings, it would save a lot of time, rather than writing it all down and then someone taking that information and transcribing it onto a document, so I don't know if the committee would want to agree that if someone, like Brian, but it doesn't have to be him, but he brought a laptop today--

It's my fault for taking my laptop.

If we had a laptop available or someone wanted to do that while we were talking, someone could be taking the documents we've agreed we can cut and throw it on a Word document and

start to organize it rather than you taking these notes and then having to go back and do that. It just seems more expedient.

Very.

And are you willing to do that, Brian?

(chuckle)

I'm pretty sure they have the technology in this room where you could do it to where everyone could see it. We can, I don't know if you work here, but I know in other meetings we have had the ability to put stuff on the projector, so that everyone can follow along.

I thought you were volunteering also capture those things people come up with, since you're part of the group.

(laughter)

I can have the documents and as we are talking I will cut and paste--

Excellent.

That document.

That would be great.

Smart idea.

That's great.

Good idea.

Thank you.

So my question would be do I need to bring a laptop in order to do that? Okay. Project is available? Okay.

We've heard the technology exists, we just don't use it.

(laughter)

That is what other people have, though.

>>Okay. Well, I think that will help a lot. I think that will cut down.

I have a laptop, it's an Apple, and I don't know if it's compatible. We have had problems at Easter Seals trying to--

I've got the same problem at Easter Seals.

Oh.

(laughter)

Let's figure out before which documents we can actually manipulate because some of them are not able, they are stagnant. But if you need to pdf 'em if we need to, that is, I am sure someone in the room--

Right, but otherwise, if the document is here, I can retype it as Word.

Sounds good.

They are only going to be, I'm not retyping the whole document for one question. (laughter)
Either way, I think it will work, whether we cut and paste or just retype it as we're talking.

Do you think we want to review what we've done and move on?

Yeah.

Are we in the middle of our, did we complete our timeline? I think we need to go back and complete it ... Did we fill in all the weeks?

We have two weeks.

Would you like me to scribe behind us, we're all looking at it, I mean, nothing facetious, I'm being serious, if we put down the dates and we can write next to it, what's ...

Yep.

Is this a whiteboard? Or is this a ... Now is there a dry erase marker?

I think it's this one here.

If you got the wrong marker, you are in serious trouble.

(laughter)

But go ahead.

Actually there is a timeline on it. You just have to erase everything else.

How about that. Does it matter--

Somebody wrote it for us.

>>Ok, the high tech one doesn't work.

Okay, so 4/22. I believe we were, Review--

All the reference materials assigned.

(lots of simultaneous conversations)

>>Katina, I would just go ahead and put all the dates up there.

Each person has what they are assigned and they are going to lead the discussion about that assignment.

>>Do you think it would make sense that the person doing the reviewing create one document?

Do you think it's necessary for everybody to go through every single document?

I was thinking about that, so a friend and I are working on the one document that we would come with a summary of what we would think were pertinent, it's just cut and paste, and you disseminate that to the group, so we're looking at it all at the same time, and then anything we are going to pull out, we can send that electronic file to Lisa, and then she can pull it out and add and go, and we're okay.

Otherwise, this is going to take forever to get through for everybody to record.

Right.

Johnny?

Yeah, could you, I'm sorry—

We have four people reporting.

Yeah.

We have four people reporting. I believe what you're saying is each person should have a summary. They should give that summary to Lisa in advance, and they should bring a copy for everyone. Is that--

Yeah.

This is Gary. I think we might be pushing a little bit considering the schedule we are on for submissions of documents in advance. It's going to be a tough schedule. We can certainly aim for that.

Well, I think it's not necessarily in advance of, you know, days in advance, but bringing a copy of it, at least. Or emailing a copy, but getting Lisa something to when she sits in the meeting, she has it ready to go.

>>Even if we have it on a thumb drive and she can just plug it in.

Okay, so everyone is in agreement with that, you can either send it to her, bring it on a thumb drive, but we want to be sure she has it in advance so she can work with it, or has it at the meeting. By the beginning.

Okay. 4/29 is where we are going to actually collate and cut and paste of all that we've discussed

So we're going to have to collate..

Does anyone care what format we use? For the document? Is that just me, that I care about that?

What you mean?

Like how are we going to put it all together, what's it going to look like, is it going to look like Pennsylvania, is it going to look like Tennessee, is it going look like Desapid? What are we submitting in the end?

This is Gary. I would suggest that either you or Lisa eyeball some of the examples and just choose a format. You can't really consider it unless you are looking at an example, and see something that's workable and go with it.

This is Katina. The yes, no, and not applicable that Desapid has out there, but I would recommend when we are looking at this, is this possibly a comment piece over there for us as well as for going through that might be where we are able to put in whatever verification we are recommending they should, you know, the folks should be looking for.

This is Lisa. I think we can consider multiple formats. I think initially we can just do kind of a parking lot, a Word document with a number of thoughts and then we can put it into a text box format where we have, a chart, whatever you want to call it and have a section for questions and so and so forth, and that if we don't like the way it looks, that's aesthetics, we can move that around at the end.

I'm sorry, I just wanted to get these on here that we know we've already talked about.

This is Gary. To further discussion while Tina is drawing pictures, one of the steps we will have to go through is subdividing the questions according to which program they would be applicable to and then once we have the proposed collection of questions on the program we will have to look at each one of that with those collections to see if it adequately captures an assessment for that service because if you look at the questions in toto it is one thing. When you subdivide them, you may end up with an inadequate picture for some of the services.

5, 6, is probably going to be more on the core then.

This is Kimberly. Quick thought. The DDDS might want to input on this in terms of back to that formatting action. They may want both residential and nonresidential to have the same look and feel. I don't know if you want to talk to Jane about that. I don't know if you have any, I'm just thinking like, the state tends to release documents to that part.

This is Susanna. I assumed that since is this just an advisory committee that if they would take it all and put it in a format that they want. That was my assumption.

They could make it unrecognizable.

(laughter)

Make it so much better.

May I make a recommendation.

She knows what I'm meaning.

(chuckling)

Hi, is Katina. May I make a recommendation at our next meeting. We also determine who is going to be breaking out at looking at the four services so we can start to go ahead of time as well.

Yup.

This is Gary. To maximize our time as we collate the questions, if the questions are proposed, we can tag them with a tentative association with each of the four program types. Some of them are going to accrue to all four and some of them are going to pretty clearly or readily fit with one program type versus another. So that will help us get to that next step.

So identify core? As well as services, right?

Right.

This is Angie. I've a question. When you are talking about core questions and then you got into services, the sub services—I guess?

The four services.

Four services. Why isn't it, or can you do it in the manner of asking the core questions, and if the answer is no, then you go to this. If the answer is yes, you then point them into that service. You know. Generally when you take a questionnaire or you do your anything, it's going to point you at some point, the answers is no, you go here. The answer is yes, you go here. So those questions could be going down to a point that points you over to that –

>>This is Suzanna, I think in the case of this, the core questions are going to apply to all four subsets. Even if it is no or yes, it's going to apply to all of them. That's the idea of having the core questions at the beginning, that it applies to every service guideline, and that might be easier to understand when we review the service guidelines next week.

Okay.

That might help, I think.

Ok, Thank you.

So 20 and 27 is going to be about the second two pieces of this, the evidence that we are looking for and the assessment process.

In two different meetings?

I don't know what everyone thinks about that. I was definitely not on the page of doing that, so I hadn't really thought about that. I thought that was for another committee.

Are we going to get clarification on that?

This is Marissa. It is totally up to the committee but it again doesn't seem to make sense to just focus on the self-assessment and not consider the entire DD assessment process. And perhaps it is again, just making some recommendations on what this committee would like to see for that process, but I don't see where it makes sense to divorce yourself from the entire DD assessment process and just focus on the tool.

This is Lisa. I would agree because I think if we don't have any idea what evidence we would recommend or consider, how are we going to make sure our questions are crafted or drafted in a way that will elicit the information for the people coming behind us to use?

I agree.

What are we calling it? What is it, the second set? What do they call it again?

It was verification, I believe.

After the self-assessment. I wanted to use the same--

(sound of writing on the board)

So making recommendations for guidance and process to administration of the self-assessment and the look behind. Yes? Does that encompass that?

That could be two days too.

Yeah.

My work done here?

There you go, well done.

I'll take a picture.

(chuckling)

(sound of papers shuffling)

Ok, Does everyone know what their tasks are for next week? Jess doesn't have a task. Do you want to work with someone on something, Jess?

I am completely confused about this whole thing. I am lost.

Okay. I am going to send you all the materials. Do you want, maybe we can sit and discuss them after you get them? Would that help?

Maybe.

Okay. We'll schedule a time to do that.

Okay, sounds good.

Yeah, join the club, ha ha.

Would you like to do that with us too, Barb? I'm willing to do that, we'll set up a time and we will all get together, and we will just go over all the materials to have you be a little better prepared for the next meeting. Okay, so everyone knows what they're assigned? I'll send out an email probably by the end of the day, if not tomorrow morning, recapping what we did today. I wish I had my computer like Brian. I think we talked, we definitely determined that you either come to the meeting, you don't send someone to substitute for you. We've established the goals for this particular meeting, and it also encompasses the two categories of actually doing the self-assessment and how we are going to verify that, and we didn't work on any of the reviewing any of the materials, but next week everyone is going to do their tasks that they are assigned. There are going to have a summary for the meeting, they will try to get it in advance to Lisa. Lisa will be our technology scribe at the next meeting. And so that will have everything. Lisa, do need a contact here to—

No, I have a sidebar conversation briefly. I will bring my laptop, and I was checking to see if there is Wi-Fi. I am not sure if I would need it, but I have a hotspot. I'll bring that too. So if I need Internet connection for some reason, I will get that, so it will give me access to email.

But I won't be at next Wednesday's meeting because I have been rescheduling my gynecologist appointment five times, so will that be a problem?

No. Will make sure you get everything, and Jess and I are going to meet any way before hand, and if we need to meet after the next meeting, we can do that, too.

Okay.

Okay? Are right,

This is Brian. Any of the discussions at the beginning of the meeting, I just want to clarify because I was not here. So I unfortunately I know I am out of town on Wednesday, May 6. And we decided that there is no, there will not be a call-in, is what I'm hearing, correct?

Correct.

I'm sorry, we didn't decide about a call in option.

Next week I know that I am leaving early, and I had it on my calendar that we could call in.

Okay.

I understand no substitute, but--

Call-in option, yes.

Great, because I can call in from where I am going to be.

Okay. And we will set that up, too, with Vicki. I'm sure she will, or Marissa will—

As long it doesn't sound like the beach in the background.

(laughter)

These special things he does –

I know.

(laughter)

I don't know if it involves the beach.

Do you mean DDR, DBS?

Any other questions? Any clarifications needed?

This is Angie. We need to send out that phone number.

For the call-in. I'll take care of it. Marissa is going to check it and make sure everyone gets it. And please, if you can notify me if you are not coming so we will know in advance of so we won't be waiting more than the 5 minutes, the five Marissa minutes that we wait?

(chuckling)

Okay, we are adjourned.